

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 151-163, 165-179, 181-195, 197-211 and 213-258 are pending in the above-identified patent application.

Claims 151-158, 161-163, 165, 167-174, 177-179, 181, 183-190, 193-195, 197 and 199-206, 209-211, 213 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knee U.S. Patent 5,589,892 ("Knee").

Claims 166, 182, 198, 214 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Arai U.S. Patent 6,486,920.

Claims 159-160, 175-176, 191-192, 207-208 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Schneidewend et al U.S. Patent 6,249,320.

Claims 215, 220-221, 226, 231-232, 237, 242-243, 248, 253-254 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Cecco et al U.S. Patent 6,310,631 ("Cecco").

Claims 216-217, 227-228, 238-239, 249-250 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Cecco, further in view of Kavalam et al U.S. Patent 6,057,836.

Claims 218-219, 229-230, 240-241, 251-252 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Cecco, further in view of Bates et al U.S. Patent 5,377,317.

Application No. 10/722,780
Final Office Action of 09/04/08
Reply to Final Office Action dated: 03/04/09

Claims 222, 233, 244, 255 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Cecco, further in view of Schindler U.S. Patent 6,081,830.

Claims 223-225, 234-235, 245-247, 256-258 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knee in view of Cecco, further in view of Wills U.S. Patent 5,434,625.

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended claims 151, 159-161, 165-167, 175-177, 181-183, 191-193, 197-199, 207-209 and 213-214 to more particularly define the claimed invention. The claim amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed and therefore add no new matter. See e.g., applicants' specification at Fig. 6, paragraphs [0089], [0090], and [0093]. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

III. Applicants' Reply

Claims 151-158, 161-163, 165, 167-174, 177-179, 181, 183-190, 193-195, 197 and 199-206, 209-11, 213 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Knee. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants' invention, as defined by amended independent claims 151, 167, 183 and 1999, is directed to a method, user equipment, a system and computer readable media for receiving a plurality of digital feeds, each of the digital feeds being associated with a particular broadcast source and containing program listings data associated with the particular broadcast source. Program listings data is selected from a

digital feed associated with a particular broadcast source. The selected program listings data comprise at least one title of a television program.

Knee discloses an electronic program schedule system for presenting television schedule information to users (See column 6, lines 1-9). However, Knee does not teach applicants' claimed invention as recited in amended base claims 151, 167, 183 and 199. More specifically, Knee does not teach or suggest "receiving at the user equipment a plurality of digital feeds, each of the digital feeds being associated with a particular broadcast source and containing program listings data associated with the particular broadcast source." (See amended base claims 151, 167, 183, and 199).

At best, Knee only generally refers to a system that receives a data stream containing program schedule information *for all television programs* and other available television services available *in the operator's geographic market* (Col. 10, lines 1-3). Indeed, Knee explicitly states that "the invention is not directed to the particular method of transmission or reception of the schedule information" (Col. 10, 37-39). In contrast, applicants' claimed invention teaches that *each of the digital feeds contains program listings data for the particular broadcast source*, as opposed to all broadcast sources. Accordingly, Knee does not teach or suggest all elements of amended base claims 151, 167, 183 and 199.

For at least this reason, the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection of amended base claims 151, 167, 183 and 199 should be withdrawn. Because claims 152-158, 162-163, 165, 168-174, 177-179, 181, 184-190, 193-195, 197 and 200-206, 209-11, and 213 depend from, and are limited by base claims 151, 167, 183

Application No. 10/722,780
Final Office Action of 09/04/08
Reply to Final Office Action dated: 03/04/09

and 199 respectively, the §102 Rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Because Arai, Schneidewend et al, Cecco et al, Kavalam et al, Bates et al, Schindler, and Wills either alone or in combination do not make up for the deficiencies of Knee, the §103 Rejections of dependent claims 159-160, 166, 175-176, 182, 191-192, 198, 207-208, 214-235, and 237-258 should also be withdrawn.

IV. Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

We believe that we have appropriately provided for fees due in connection with this submission. However, if there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this Response, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. 003597-0123 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher P. Carroll/

Christopher P. Carroll
Reg. No. 55,776
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 75563